DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

LAW OFFICES

GOLDBERG, GODLES, WIENER & WRIGHT 1229 NINETEENTH STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

HENRY GOLDBERG
JOSEPH A. GODLES
JONATHAN L. WIENER
HENRIETTA WRIGHT
MARY J. DENT
DANIEL S. GOLDBERG
W. KENNETH FERREE
THOMAS G. GHERARDI, P.C.
COUNSEL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

(202) 429-4900 TELECOPIER: (202) 429-4912

September 20, 1995

RECEIVED
SEP 2 0 1995)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

BY HAND

Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

Re:

PR Docket No. 93-253, PR Docket 89-553, GN Docket

No. 93-252 Ex parte Presentation

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The letter reports that on behalf of RAM Mobile Data USA Limited Partnership ("RMD"), Steven Apicella, Vice President-Regulatory Affairs' for RMD, David Richards, General Attorney for BellSouth Corporation, and the undersigned spoke with Rosalind Allen, Amy Zoslov, Gregory Rosston, Evan Kwerel, and Jackie Chorney to discuss RMD's concerns regarding the activity rules that have been announced in the above referenced proceeding.

No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary September 20, 1995 Page 2

A summary of RMD's presentation and a chart showing the particular effects of the activity rule on RMD's existing licensed blocks, both distributed at the meeting, are attached to this letter.

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan L. Wiener

Attorney for

RAM Mobile Data USA Limited Partnership

Enclosures

cc: Rosalind K. Allen
Amy Zoslov
Gregory Rosston
Evan R. Kwerel
Jackie Chorney
David Richards
Ben Almond
Steven T. Apicella

September 20, 1995
RAM Mobile Data USA Limited Partnership

<u>Ex Parte Presentation</u>
PR Docket No. 89-553
PP Docket No. 93-253
GN Docket No. 93-252

ASSIGNING VASTLY DIFFERENT ACTIVITY UNIT VALUES TO BLOCKS WITHIN THE SAME MTAS WILL GROSSLY DISTORT THE AUCTIONS FOR 900 MHZ SMRS

- Unless changed, the activity rules will force licensees who are seeking
 expansion frequencies either to "park" their bids on blocks that they don't want
 or bid on what they want, but irrevocably foreclose their ability to bid on
 potential substitutes should the bidding on more heavily encumbered blocks
 within the MTA later exceed the bids for less encumbered or unencumbered
 frequencies in the same MTA.
- The gross disparities in assigned activity unit values of different frequency blocks within MTAs will have an immediate and devastating impact on the auctions. <u>E.g.</u>,
 - •• Los Angeles: 159,004 units (low) to 3,600,000 units (high)
 - •• New York: 442,116 (low) to 3,239,300 (high)
- The proposed activity rules thwart the purpose of the simultaneous auctions which is to allow bidders reasonable flexibility to change their bids to effective substitutes.
 - •• The most likely "substitutes" will be found among properties within each MTA and not between MTAs.
 - • By contrast, it is highly unlikely that any bidder would view a sliver of the New York MTA as a substitute for St. Louis.
 - •• While an existing licensee reasonably would prefer to stay on its same block of frequencies within the MTA, other frequencies in the MTA, particularly those that are less encumbered, could be substituted, albeit in some cases not as easily, for expansion purpose and/or to establish a regional network.
 - •• The underlying assumption about the comparative values of blocks, which underlies the activity rules is flawed. To an existing licensee, a more encumbered block on its own frequencies is likely to be more, or at least no less, valuable than a less encumbered block in the same MTA, which the licensee does not already occupy.

- •• The value of interstitial areas to an otherwise built system is not simply the MHz/pops of the area.
- • Trying to equate the value of partial MTA areas in New York or Los Angeles with full MTAs that cover Montana is not likely to yield an accurate or even an approximate result.
- The proposed activity rules may also lead to unencumbered or less encumbered blocks being undervalued.
- Flexibility to bid among blocks within individual MTAs needs to be restored.
 - Best solution: assign each ten-channel block within any given MTA the same number of activity units. To take into account that some MTAs are more encumbered than others, base the assigned activity unit value for each MTA upon the average amount that each block is encumbered.
 - •• Alternative: Grants bidders an automatic waiver of the activity rules to change the frequency blocks on which they are bidding within an MTA -- up to what could be justified by their initial up front payment -- as long as immediately prior to the application of the waiver they had been the high bidder (but is now outbid) or made a qualifying bid on a different block (or an equal number of blocks) within the MTA.
- RMD understands that time is of the essence, but urges that some redress is needed.

RAM MOBILE DATA USA, L.P. KARNAK PROJECT

						Payments on An Alterantive Properties				VARIANCE	over/ (under) l	RAM'	s pymt	RAM's payment as % of				
Market	Block	Priori	ity	RAM's Upfrent Psyment	\$0.02 per Mhz-Pop	Highest Upfront Payment	2nd Highest Upfront Payment	3rd Highest Upfront Payment		Highest Upfront Payment	2nd Highest Upfront Payment		3rd Highest Upfront Payment	\$0.02 per Mhz-Pop	Highest Upfront Payment	2nd Highest Upfront Payment	3rd Highest Upfront Payment	
New York	A	1	s	20,250.51 \$	132,052.99	\$ 64,785.99	\$ 64,536.29 \$	64,536.29	\$	44,535.48	44,285.78	\$	44,285.78	15%	31%	31%	31%	
New York	D	1	\$	8,842.32 \$	132,052.99	\$ 64,785.99	\$ 64,536.29 \$	64,536.29	\$	55,943.67	55,693.97	\$	55,693.97	7%	14%	14%	14%	
New York	0	1	\$	26,899.78 \$	132,052.99	\$ 64,785.99	\$ 64,536.29 \$	64,536.29	\$	37,886.21	37,636.51	\$	37,636.51	20%	42%	42%	42%	
Los Angeles-San Diego	н	ı	\$	3,180.08 \$	95,726.16	\$ 76,481.38	<u> </u>	68,1 <i>77.7</i> 7	\$	73,301.30	69,436.21	\$	64,997.69	3%	4%	4%	5%	
Los Angeles-San Diego	L	ì	\$	5, 694 .98 \$	95,726.16	\$ 76,481.38	\$ 72,616.29 \$	68,177.77	\$	70,786.40	•	\$	62,482.79	6%	7%	8%	8%	
Los Angeles-San Diego	R	1	\$	13,226.86 \$	95,726.16	\$ 76,481.38	\$ 72,616.29 \$	68,177.77	\$	63,254.52	59,389.43	\$	54,950.91	14%	17%	18%	19%	
Chicago	c	1	\$	5,647.57 \$	60,348.50	\$ 28,914.41		28,914.41	\$	23,266.84			23,266.84	9%	20%	20%	20%	
Chicago	F	1	\$	5,575.03 \$	60,348.50	\$ 28,914.41		28,914.41	\$	23,339.38	•	\$	23,339.38	9%	19%	19%	19%	
Chicago	K	ì	\$	5,647.57 \$	60,348.50	\$ 28,914.41	\$ 28,914.41 \$	28,914.41	\$	23,266.84	23,266.84	\$	23,266.84	9%	20%	20%	20%	
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose	G	1	\$	12,058.92 \$	59,455,89	\$ 55,856.54	\$ 55,772.62 \$	48,830.00	\$	43,797.62	43,713.70	2	36,771.08	20%	22%	22%	25%	
San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose	Н	i	\$	12,058.92 \$	59,455.89	\$ 55,856.54	\$ 55,772.62 \$	48,830.00	\$	43,797.62		•	36,771.08	20%	22%	22%	25%	
Detroit	F	1	\$	8,074.93 \$	50,005.05	\$ 50,005.05	\$ 50,005.05 \$	50,005.05	\$	41,930.12	41,930.12	\$	41,930.12	16%	16%	16%	16%	
Detroit	I	1	\$	8,203.08 \$	50,005.05	\$ 50,005.05	\$ 50,005.05 \$	50,005.05	\$	41,801.97	41,801.97	\$	41,801.97	16%	16%	16%	16%	
Charlotte-Greensboro-Greenville-	F	1	\$	23,143.11 \$	48,761.59	\$ 48,761.59	\$ 48,761.59 \$	48,761.59	\$	25,618.48	25,618.48	\$	25,618.48	47%	47%	47%	47%	
Dallas-Fort Worth	J	1	\$	24,512.91 \$	48,470.79		\$ 37,307.94 \$	36,109.51	\$	14,215.45	12,795.03	\$	11,596.60	51%	63 %	66%	68%	
Dallas-Fort Worth	M	1	\$	24,512.91 \$	48,470.79	\$ 38,728.36	\$ 37,307.94 \$	36,109.51	\$	14,215.45	12,795.03	\$	11,596.60	51%	63%	66%	68%	
Boston-Providence	I	ì	\$	9,846.01 \$	47,263.56	\$ 31,102.50		30,213.57	\$	21,256.49	20,450.11	\$	20,367.56	21%	32%	32 %	33%	
Boston-Providence	J	. 1	\$	5,997.06 \$	47,263.56	\$ 31,102.50		30,213.57	\$	25,105.44	24,299.06	\$	24,216.51	13%	19%	20%	20%	
Boston-Providence	T	i	\$	9,846.01 \$	47,263.56	\$ 31,102.50	\$ 30,296.12 \$	30,213.57	\$	21,256.49	20,450.11	\$	20,367.56	21%	32%	32 %	33%	
Philadelphia	Α	1	S	2,552.39 \$	44,638.74	\$ 44,638.74	\$ 44,638.74 \$	33,644,10	\$	42,086.35	42,086.35	2	31,091.71	6%	6%	6%	8%	
Philadelphia	0	1	\$	2,582.91 \$	44,638.74	\$ 44,638.74		33,644.10	\$	42,055.83	,		31,061.19	6%	6%	6%	R%	
Washington-Baltimore	F	1	\$	4,515.84 \$	38,889.38	\$ 33,080.23	\$ 32,675.47 \$	21,065.71	\$	28,564.39	28,159.63	\$	16,549.87	12%	14%	14%	21%	
Washington-Baltimore	О	1	\$	3,899.61 \$	38,889.38	\$ 33,080.23	\$ 32,675.47 \$	21,065.71	\$	29,180.62	28,775.86	\$	17,166.10	10%	12%	12%	19%	
Atlanta	R	1	\$	13,496.02 \$	34,710.42	\$ 34,710.42	\$ 34,645.93 \$	29,029,49	\$	21,214.40	21,149.91	\$	15,533.47	39%	39%	39%	46%	
Minneapolis-St. Paul	F	1	\$	17,517.66 \$	29,930.20	\$ 29,930.20	\$ 29,930.20 \$	29,930.20	\$	12,412.54	12,412.54	\$	12,412.54	59%	59%	59%	59%	
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Orlando	G	1	\$	16,482.43 \$	27,088.94	\$ 27,088.94	\$ 21,561.41 \$	18,713.72	\$	10,606.51 \$	5,078.98	s	2,231.29	61%	61%	76%	88%	
Tampa-St. Petersburg-Orlando	О	1	\$	2,432.53 \$	27,088.94	\$ 27,088.94	\$ 21,561.41 \$	18,713.72	\$	24,656.41	19,128.88	\$	16,281.19	9%	9%	11%	13%	

RAM MOBILE DATA USA, L.P. KARNAK PROJECT

						Payments on An Alterantive Properties				VARIANCE or	ver/ (under) RAN	1's pyrnt	RAM's payment as % of			
				RAM's		Highest	2nd Highest	3rd Highest		Highest	2nd Highest	3rd Highest		Highest	2nd Highest	3rd Highest
				Upfront	\$0.02 per	Upfront	Upfront	Upfront		Upfrent	Upfront	Upfront	\$0.02 per	Upfront	Upfreet	Upfront
Market	Block	Prior	ity	Payment	Mhz-Pop	Payment	<u>Payment</u>	Payment		Payment	Payment.	Payment	Mhz-Pop	Payment	Payment.	Payment
Houston	N	1	\$	5,200.70 \$	25,954.25	\$ 22,063.36	15,560.72 \$	14,142.34	\$	16,862.66 \$	10,360.02 \$	8,941.64	20%	24 %	33 %	37%
Houston	T	1	\$	5,200.70 \$	25,954.25	\$ 22,063.36	15,560.72 \$	14,142.34	\$	16,862.66 \$	10,360.02 \$	8,941.64	20%	24%	33%	37%
Miami-Fort Lauderdale	В	1	\$	3,895.05 \$	25,682.91	\$ 17,854.50	13,110.94 \$	12,072.87	\$	13,959.45 \$	9,215.89 \$	8,177.82	15%	22%	30%	32 %
Cleveland	D	1	\$	757.01 \$	24,728.75	\$ 24,728.75		24,728.75	\$	23,971.74 \$	23,971.74 \$	23,971.74	3%	3%	3%	3%
Cleveland	F	1	\$	716.25 \$	24,728.75	\$ 24,728.75	24,728.75	24,728.75	\$	24,012.50 \$	24,012.50 \$	24,012.50	3%	3%	3%	3%
New Orleans-Baton Rouge	F	1	\$	7,892.63 \$	24,626.35	\$ 24,626.35	24,626.35 \$	24,626.35	\$	16,733.72 \$	16,733.72 \$	16,733.72	32%	32%	32%	32 %
Cincinnati-Dayton	F	1	\$	5,069.41 \$	23,583.33	\$ 23,583.33	23,583.33 \$	23,583.33	\$	18,513.92 \$	18,513.92 \$	18,513.92	21%	21%	21%	21%
St. Louis	F	1	\$	10,178.74 \$	23,319.63	\$ 23,319.63	23,319.63 \$	23,319.63	\$	13,140.89 \$	13,140.89 \$	13,140.89	44%	44%	44%	44%÷
Milwaukee	F	1	\$	7,558.84 \$	22,707.16	\$ 22,707.16	22,707.16 \$	22,707.16	\$	15,148.32 \$	15,148.32 \$	15,148.32	33%	33%	33%	33%
Pittsburgh	F	ì	\$	3,285.86 \$	20,513.83	\$ 20,513.83	20,513.83 \$	20,513.83	\$	17,227.97 \$	17,227.97 \$	17,227.97	16%	16%	16%	16%
Denver	F	1	\$	5,858.41 \$	19,403.19	\$ 19,403.19	19,403.19 \$	19,403.19	\$	13,544.78 \$	13,544.78 \$	13,544.78	30%	30%	30%	30%
Richmond-Norfolk	F	1	S	2,859.70 \$	19,231.05	\$ 19,231.05	19,231.05 \$	19,231.05	\$	16,371.35 \$	16,371.35 \$	16,371.35	15%	15%	15%	15%
Seattle	F	1	\$	2,842.79 \$	19,135.88	\$ 19,135.88	19,135.88 \$	19,135.88	\$	16,293.09 \$	16,293.09 \$	16,293.09	15%	15%	15%	15%
Seattle	Н	1	\$	2,756.26 \$	19,135.88	\$ 19,135.88	19,135.88	19,135.88	\$	16,379.62 \$	16,379.62 \$	16,379.62	14%	14%	14%	14%
Louisville-Lexington-Evansville	F	1	\$	9,597.78 \$	17,783.24	\$ 17,783.24	17,783.24 \$	17,783.24	\$	8,185.46 \$	8,185.46 \$	8,185.46	54%	54%	54%	54%
Phoenix	F	1	\$	3,658.44 \$	17,550.70	\$ 17,550.70	17,550.70 \$	17,550.70	\$	13,892.26 \$	13,892.26 \$	13,892.26	21%	21%	21%	21%
Memphis-Jackson	F	1	\$	9,763.51 \$	17,326.13	\$ 17,326.13	17,326.13 \$	17,326.13	\$	7,562.62 \$	7,562.62 \$	7,562.62	56%	56%	56%	56%
Birmingham	F	1	\$	10,295.30 \$	16,220.38	\$ 16,220.38	16,220.38 \$	16,220.38	\$	5,925.08 \$	5,925.08 \$	5,925.08	63%	63%	63%	63%
Portland	н	1	\$	5,149.96 \$	15,299.74	\$ 15,299.74	\$ 15,299.74 \$	15,299.74	\$	10,149.78 \$	10,149.78 \$	10,149.78	34%	34%	34%	34%
Indianapolis	F	1	\$	5,656.23 \$	15,087.38	\$ 15,087.38	15,087.38 \$	15,087.38	\$	9,431.15 \$	9,431.15 \$	9,431.15	37%	37%	37%	37%
Des Moines-Quad Cities	F	1	\$	9,054.17 \$	15,030.70	\$ 15,030.70	\$. 15,030.70 \$	15,030.70	\$	5,976.53 \$	5,976.53 \$	5,976.53	60%	60%	60%	60%
San Antonio	F	1	\$	6,302.27 \$	14,932.62	\$ 14,932.62	14,932.62 \$	14,932.62	\$	8,630.35 \$	8,630.35 \$	8,630.35	42%	42%	42 %	42%

RAM MOBILE DATA USA, L.P. KARNAK PROJECT

								Payments on A	An Alterantive	Properties		VARIANC	ver/ (under) RA	M's pymt		RAM's payment as % of					
Market Kansas City	Block F	<u>Prio</u> i	rity S	Upf Payr		\$9.92 per Mkx-Pop 14,566.52	5	Highest Upfront Payment 14,566.52 \$	2nd Highest Upfront Payment 14,566.52 \$	3rd Highest Upfront Payment 14,566.52	s	Highest Upfront Payment 8,287.63	\$	2nd Highest Upfront Payment 8,287.63	3rd High Upfre Payme 8,287	ent ent	\$0.02 per Mhz-Pop 43%	Highest Upfront Payment 43%	2nd Highest Upfront Payment 43%	3rd Highest Upfront Payment 43%	
Buffalo-Rochester	D	1	\$	2,02	3.02 \$	13,885.23	3	13,885.23 \$	13,885.23 \$	13,885.23	\$	11,857.21	\$	11,857.21 \$	11,857.	21	15%	15%	15%	15%	
Salt Lake City	F	1	1	4,59	.82 \$	12,866.86	\$	12,866.86	12,866.86	12,866.86	\$	8,267.04	\$	8,267.04	8,267.	04	36%	36%	36%	36%	
Jacksonville	0	1	\$	3,85	3.86 \$	11,374.67	\$	11,374.67 \$	11,374.67	11,374.67	\$	7,520.81	\$	7,520.81	7,520	81	34%	34%	34%	34%	
Columbus	F	t	\$	2,70	2.37 \$	10,727.81	3	10,727.81 \$	10,727.81 \$	10,727.81	\$	8,025.44	\$	8,025.44 \$	8,025	44	25%	25%	25%	25%	
El Paso-Albuquerque	F	1	•	4,14	5.75 \$	10,569.45	3	10,569.45	10,569.45	10,569.45	\$	6,422.70	\$	6,422.70	6,422.	70	39%	39%	39%	39%	
Little Rock	F	1	•	7,64	9.46 \$	10,258.34	5	10,258.34 \$	10,258.34	10,258.34	\$	2,608.88	\$	2,608.88 \$	2,608.	88	75%	75%	75%	75%	
Oklahoma City	F	1	:	4,79	3.90 \$	9,387.39	\$	9,387.39 \$	9,387.39	9,387.39	\$	4,593.49	\$	4,593.49	4,593.	49	51%	51%	51%	51%	
Spokane-Billings	F	1		6,38	7.03 \$	9,316.68	\$	9,316.42 \$	9,316.42 \$	9,316.42	\$	2,929.39	\$	2,929.39	2,929.	39	69%	69%	69%	69%	
Nashville	F	1	;	2,93	3.00 \$	8,836.96	3	8,836.96 \$	8,836.96 \$	8,836.96	\$	5,903.96	\$	5,903.96	5,903	96	33%	33%	33%	33%	
Knoxville	F	1	:	2,67	2.62 \$	8,609.56	\$	8,609.56 \$	8,609.56 \$	8,609.56	\$	5,936.94	\$	5,936.94	5,936.	94	31%	31%	31%	31%	
Omaha	F	i	:	3,63	.89 \$	8,296.37	\$	8,296.37	8,296.37 \$	8,296.37	\$	4,662.48	\$	4,662.48 \$	4,662	48	44%	44%	44%	44 %	
Wichita	F	ı	:	3,18	3.88 \$	5,620.87	\$	5,620.87	5,620.87 \$	5,620.87	\$	2,431.99	\$	2,431.99 \$	2,431	99	57%	57%	57%	57%	
Honolulu	F	1	:		0.34 \$		\$	5,540.50 \$	5,540.50 \$		\$	4,181.16		4,181.16	•		25%	25%	25%	25%	
Honoluku	н	1	:	1,35	9.34 \$	5,541.15	\$	5,540.50 \$	5,540.50	5,540.50	\$	4,181.16	\$	4,181.16	4,181.	16	25%	25%	25%	25%	
Tuisa	F	ì	!	1,44	5.08 \$	5,481.98	\$	5,481.98 \$	5,481.98 \$	5,481.98	\$	4,035.90	\$	4,035.90 \$	4,035.	90	26%	26%	26%	26%	
Grand Total			3	479,28	.21 \$	2,255,499.35	\$	1,075,821.20 \$	503,290.19 \$	191,842.04 1,770,953.43	\$	1,319,974.90	\$	1,272,524.88 \$	1,182,284.	64					